REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 8 were rejected as obvious from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. Henderson et al. was cited as showing substantially the claimed closed circuit television system for an in flight entertainment system for an aircraft in Figure 4, as described from column 5, line 4 to column 6, line 25. Claim 1 recites "a plurality of personal control units connected to said in flight entertainment local area network, each of said plurality of personal control units corresponding to respective ones of said plurality of video display modules and connected to said video camera control module for operating the video camera control module to independently select a desired field of view for each of said video display modules." In the Office Action of October 11, 2000, it was indicated that Henderson et al. did not disclose a plurality of personal control units each corresponding to respective ones of the plurality of video display modules and connected to the video camera control module for operating the video camera control module to independently select a desired field of view for each of said video display modules.

Baker et al. was cited as showing a plurality of video display modules and a plurality of person control units, in Figure 8. Referring to column 12, lines 6-8, lines 28-41 and column 13, lines 8-13 of Baker et al., the Examiner argued that Baker et al discloses a

plurality of personal control units attached to each of the video control modules 80, to provide substantially the same if not the same independent selection of a desired field of view for each of the video display modules as claimed.

The Examiner's attention is directed to column 1, lines 8-10 and 31-45 of Baker et al. There it is explained that Baker et al. relates to visual imaging system and techniques which provide electronic manipulation of wide angle hemispheric scenes, such as the multimedia technique used at theme parks, of displaying on a screen or collection of screens that covers almost 360 degrees field of view. In displaying such a scene in a 360 degree field of view, the display constructs abutting subimages. According to the cited passage in Baker et al., at column 12, lines 6-8, the system of Baker et al. "allows the user to construct abutting subimages in the (x,y) plane without danger of edge interference." This is consistent only with a single user having a single control of assembling images. Otherwise, if a plurality of controls were allowed by Baker et al., with independent control by a plurality of users, it is completely unreasonable to conclude that such abutting subimages for a unified 360 degree field of view scene could be achieved. It is therefore submitted that the Examiner's interpretation of Baker et al. as teaching a plurality of personal control units is untenable.

Furthermore, the Examiner referred to "the plurality of personal control units attached to each of the video control modules 80 of Baker et al," and the Examiner referred

to Figure 8 of Baker et al., as showing a plurality of video display modules and supposedly showing a plurality of personal control units. Figure 8 of Baker et al. shows a plurality of image processing subsystem 80, connected to a corresponding plurality of random access memory digital-to-analog converters (RAMDAC) 78, each of which are shown as having outputs to displays. No input is shown or disclosed as coming from the displays.

Data and control are shown as coming from a host bus 76 described in Baker et al. at column 11 lines 62-64 as a bus interface and control circuitry providing an interface to the host system, such as MCA (IBM's 32 bit bus) and ISA (a PC expansion bus, used for modems, video displays, speakers, and other peripherals). Thus the data and control features of Baker et al. also do not provide any teaching, disclosure or suggestion of a "plurality of person control units." Baker et al. contains no teaching, disclosure, or suggestion whatsoever of a "plurality of person control units," contains no motivation for providing "plurality of person control units," and ultimately teaches directly away from providing "plurality of person control units" for multiple users for independently controlling their own individual displays. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 2 and 8 are novel and inventive over Henderson et al. and Baker et al., taken either individually or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 8 on the grounds of obviousness from Henderson et al. and Baker et al. should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 was also rejected as obvious from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. as applied to Claims 1 and 2. Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, so that it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 3 also should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant has raised no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, and that the application is now in a condition for allowance. An early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

James W. Paul
Registration No. 29,967

JWP/rvw
Encls.:Return Postcard

HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Tele. No. (310) 824-5555
Facsimile No. (310) 824-9696